**CIF v3.9**
**Historical Research Module v1.2**
**Requires: CIF v3.9 Core Framework**

**Convergent Inference Framework Ecosystem**
**Companion: CIF v3.9 Core | Genealogy Module v1.2**

**April 2026**

**Module Version**
Historical Research Module v1.2 — Updated April 2026

**Requires**
CIF v3.9 Core Framework

**Amendment**
Companion reference updated to v3.9. No new domain-specific additions; the Autonomous Execution Protocol (AEP) is a Core-level operational mode. All content from v1.1 carries forward unchanged.

**Status**
Active

**Change Note — v1.2 (Updated for CIF v3.9 Companion Alignment)**

One addition relative to v1.1: Companion reference updated to align with CIF v3.9 Core Framework — Autonomous Execution Edition. All domain-specific guidance carries forward unchanged from Historical Research Module v1.1.

**Addition 1 — Historical Research-specific Phase 0b guidance**
The core Phase 0b Hypothesis Listing requirement is defined in CIF v3.9 Core. This module adds three mandatory hypothesis categories for historical research deployments — Single-Cause Primary, Multi-Factor Cascade, and Counter-Narrative — with the Counter-Narrative Hypothesis Obligation formally documented.

**Addition 2 — Historical Research-specific Source Lineage Verification guidance**
Source Lineage Verification (Phase II, CIF v3.9 Core) has specific historical research application. Pre-modern historical research is particularly vulnerable to derivative chain propagation. This section provides history-specific SLV guidance for pre-modern source chains, institutional inquiry derivatives, and modern scholarship derivative chains.

**Addition 3 — Phase V Cross-Reference Note (v3.9 alignment)**
Integration note connecting the Counter-Narrative Hypothesis Obligation (Phase 0b, this module) to the Assessment Suppression Category 6 clearance procedure (Phase V, CIF v3.9

Core). The Counter-Narrative Hypothesis Obligation establishes the obligation at Phase 0b; Category 6 is the Phase V mechanism that enforces it.

**Historical Research — Phase 0b Guidance**

**Mandatory Hypothesis Categories for Historical Research Deployments**

In addition to the core Phase 0b requirements, every historical research CIF deployment must include at least one hypothesis from each of the following categories:

**Category:** Single-Cause Primary
**Description:** One factor is the primary or determining cause of the historical event
**Example:** Weather as primary driver; administrative failure as primary cause; arson as primary cause

**Category:** Multi-Factor Cascade
**Description:** Multiple factors converged and each was necessary; no single factor was sufficient
**Example:** Weather + urban structure + fuel load + containment failure all necessary

**Category:** Counter-Narrative
**Description:** The dominant historical attribution is politically or socially produced rather than evidentially established
**Example:** Arson attribution produced by wartime xenophobia rather than genuine evidence

**Category:** Structural Indeterminacy
**Description:** The evidence base is currently insufficient to determine the primary causal factor — always mandatory
**Example:** SI required in every deployment

**COMPLIANCE RULE:** A historical research Phase 0b that does not include a Multi-Factor Cascade hypothesis is incomplete whenever the event under study involves multiple documented contributing factors.

**Counter-Narrative Hypothesis Obligation**

Every historical research deployment must include at least one hypothesis proposing that the dominant historical attribution — the explanation that became the accepted account in subsequent historiography — is politically, socially, or institutionally produced rather than evidentially established. This does not require the analyst to believe the counter-narrative. It requires that it be formally constructed and stress-tested.

**RATIONALE:** Historical narratives fossilise. The accepted explanation for a historical event frequently reflects the interests of those who controlled its documentation rather than the weight

of evidence available at the time. CIF's adversarial stress testing is specifically designed to expose this — but only if a counter-narrative model exists to be tested.

**Phase V — Assessment Suppression and Counter-Narrative: Cross-Reference Note (v3.9 Alignment)**

The following integration note connects the Counter-Narrative Hypothesis Obligation established at Phase 0b (this module) to the Assessment Suppression Category 6 clearance procedure formalised in CIF v3.9 Core. Both address the same underlying failure mode at different phases.

**The Enforcement Chain**

**Phase:** Phase 0b
**Mechanism:** Counter-Narrative Hypothesis Obligation (this module)
**What It Enforces:** The analyst must register a counter-narrative hypothesis before evidence registration opens. This ensures the counter-narrative enters the model set rather than being excluded at the framing stage.

**Phase:** Phase III
**Mechanism:** Model Registration Obligation (CIF v3.9 Core)
**What It Enforces:** The counter-narrative hypothesis must be formally constructed as a competing model or formally retired with documented justification. It cannot remain a narrative possibility.

**Phase:** Phase V
**Mechanism:** Assessment Suppression Category 6 Diagnostic Q1-Q4 (CIF v3.9 Core)
**What It Enforces:** The analyst must confirm that contradicting evidence items — including those that support the counter-narrative model — have been addressed at Phase III, held to the same evidentiary standard as supporting items, and weighted on methodological rather than narrative grounds.

**Phase:** Phase VII
**Mechanism:** Suppression Sensitivity Flag (CIF v3.9 Core)
**What It Enforces:** If Q3 of the Category 6 diagnostic raises a Suppression Sensitivity Flag, the Phase VII tier statement must disclose that the leading model's tier is sensitive to the unverified status of items that support the counter-narrative.

**Application to Institutional Inquiry Findings**

The Institutional Inquiry Independence Assessment (Phase V gate, this module) and the Assessment Suppression Category 6 diagnostic address related but distinct concerns. The Institutional Inquiry Independence Assessment asks whether a finding was produced under conditions that affect its reliability — that is, whether the inquiry's conclusions were structurally

compromised. The Category 6 diagnostic asks whether the analyst has adequately weighted findings that cut against the leading model, including findings from institutional inquiries that contradict the preferred conclusion.

**INTEGRATION NOTE:** An institutional inquiry finding that supports the counter-narrative model is subject to both mechanisms. The Institutional Inquiry Independence Assessment evaluates the finding's reliability. The Category 6 diagnostic Q2 ensures it has been held to the same evidentiary standard as inquiry findings that support the leading model. An analyst who applies more scrutiny to counter-narrative inquiry findings than to supporting inquiry findings is committing Assessment Suppression regardless of the outcome of the Independence Assessment.

**Practical Implication for Historical Research Deployments**

In historical research deployments where the Counter-Narrative Hypothesis Obligation has been satisfied at Phase 0b, the Phase V Category 6 diagnostic Q1 directly asks: have the evidence items registered in Phase I that support the counter-narrative model been addressed in Phase III model construction? If the counter-narrative model was constructed at Phase III, Q1 is satisfied by that construction. If the counter-narrative model was retired at Phase III, Q1 requires that the retirement documentation specifically addresses the contradicting evidence items — not merely the hypothesis implausibility.

**COMPLIANCE NOTE:** A counter-narrative hypothesis retired at Phase III on grounds of implausibility without a confirmed primary record contradiction is a Phase III compliance failure (Model Registration Obligation). A counter-narrative hypothesis retired with a confirmed primary record contradiction but whose supporting evidence items are subsequently ignored in Phase V analysis is an Assessment Suppression failure. Both compliance rules are independent and both must be satisfied.

**Module Gates — Unchanged from v1.0**

**Gate:** Pre-Modern Source Criticism Gate
**Trigger:** Any Primary Record item is a pre-modern document (before approximately 1800 CE)
**Executes Within:** Phase I — before closure
**Mandatory?** Yes — when triggered

**Gate:** Institutional Inquiry Independence Assessment
**Trigger:** Any model draws on the findings of a formal institutional inquiry as evidential support
**Executes Within:** Phase V — Category 5 audit
**Mandatory?** Yes — when triggered

**Gate:** Eyewitness Single-Source Flag

**Trigger:** Any causal chain in any model depends primarily on a single contemporary eyewitness account
**Executes Within:** Phase III — vulnerability register
**Mandatory?** Yes — when triggered

**Historical Research — Source Lineage Verification Guidance**

Source Lineage Verification (Phase II, CIF v3.9 Core) requires tracing every convergence cluster item to its earliest known source and collapsing derivative items before convergence classification is assigned. Pre-modern historical research presents specific derivative chain patterns that must be identified and resolved before any Evidence-driven classification is assigned.

**Historical Research Derivative Chain Types**

**Chain Type:** Chronicle → Later History → Modern Synthesis
**Description:** A medieval or early modern chronicle account is cited by a later history, which is cited by a modern synthesis, which is cited by an online encyclopaedia or reference work.
**SLV Action Required:** Trace to the chronicle. Collapse all derivative histories, syntheses, and reference works into a single chain. Count only the chronicle as the primary source.

**Chain Type:** Official Record → Published Transcription → Secondary Commentary
**Description:** A parliamentary record, court document, or administrative survey is published in a transcription volume. Secondary scholars cite the transcription. Tertiary sources cite the secondary scholarship.
**SLV Action Required:** Trace to the official record. The transcription volume is a Secondary Source with transmission integrity risk. All secondary and tertiary citations collapse to the transcription which collapses to the official record.

**Chain Type:** Eyewitness Account → Contemporary Compilation → Later Citation
**Description:** A diary or letter account is quoted or summarised in a contemporary compilation. Later scholars cite the compilation rather than the original diary.
**SLV Action Required:** Trace to the original diary or letter. Assess whether the compilation accurately transmits the original. Do not treat the compilation and the original account as independent sources.

**Chain Type:** Institutional Inquiry Finding → Press Report → Subsequent History
**Description:** An official inquiry produces a finding. Contemporary press reports the finding. Later histories cite the press report rather than the inquiry record.
**SLV Action Required:** Trace to the inquiry record. Press reports of institutional findings are derivatives. Where the press report is the only surviving access to a lost inquiry record, assess for Recovered Primary Evidence status.

**Chain Type:** AI Synthesis → Cross-engine Convergence

**Description:** Multiple AI engines independently produce similar accounts of the same historical event. The apparent cross-engine convergence may reflect shared training data from the same historical scholarship rather than independent analysis.
**SLV Action Required:** Trace AI Synthesis items to their probable training data sources. Cross-engine convergence on well-documented historical events is Architecture-driven until provenance independence is confirmed.

**COMPLIANCE RULE:** A historical research convergence cluster classified as Evidence-driven without documented Source Lineage Verification confirming independent upstream sources is non-compliant. The most common historical research SLV failure is treating two modern scholarly works that both cite the same primary source as two independent streams of support. They are one primary source with two secondary interpretations.

**CIF v3.9 | Historical Research Module v1.2 | April 2026 | Requires CIF v3.9 Core Framework**

---